

COLLEEN FLYNN, SBN 234281  
*cflynnlaw@yahoo.com*  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
3435 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2900  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
Telephone: (213) 252-9444  
Facsimile: (213) 252-0091

PAULA D. PEARLMAN, SBN 109038  
*paula.pearlman@lls.edu*  
MICHELLE UZETA, SBN 164402  
*michelle.uzeta@lls.edu*  
RICHARD DIAZ, SBN 285459  
*richard.diaz@lls.edu*  
DISABILITY RIGHTS LEGAL  
CENTER  
DISABILITY RIGHTS LEGAL  
CENTER  
800 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1120  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: (213) 736-1496  
Facsimile: (213) 736-1428

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Relator

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

UNITED STATES of AMERICA and THE  
STATE of CALIFORNIA, *ex rel.*, SHELBY  
EIDSON,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AURORA LAS ENCINAS LLC, ,  
SIGNATURE HEALTHCARE SERVICES  
LLC, AND DOES 1 THROUGH 10, jointly  
and severally,

Defendants.

MARK A. KLEIMAN, SBN 115919  
*mkleiman@quitam.org*  
LAW OFFICES OF MARK ALLEN  
KLEIMAN  
2907 Stanford Avenue  
Venice, CA 90292  
Telephone: (310) 306-8094  
Facsimile: (310) 306-8491

CASE NO.: 2:10-cv-1031 JAK (RZx)  
(Hon. John A. Kronstadt)

**RELATOR'S REPLY TO  
DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO  
RELATOR'S MOTION IN LIMINE  
NO. 5 TO EXCLUDE EMAILS  
BETWEEN DR. HARASZTI AND THE  
RELATOR, IN THEIR ENTIRETY,  
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULES OF  
EVIDENCE 401, 402, AND 403**

DATE: June 6, 2013  
TIME: 2:30 P.M.  
CRTRM: 750

1 Plaintiff hereby submits the following in Reply to Defendants' Opposition to  
 2 Plaintiff's Motion in Limine No. 5 to Exclude Emails Between Dr. Haraszti and the  
 3 Relator, in Their Entirety Pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 401, 402, and 403.

4 **I. DEFENDANTS' ACCUSATIONS OF FACTUAL MISSTATMENTS**  
 5 **ARE WITHOUT MERIT**

6 Defendant's claim that Relator's motion contains factual misstatements is false.  
 7 Relator's representation that no party intends to call Dr. Haraszti as a witness is  
 8 supported by the parties' witness lists, filed with the court on May 18, 2013. (Doc.  
 9 485 & 487). Relator's representation that Defendants failed to identify the specific  
 10 emails they planned to admit into evidence is supported by email exchanges between  
 11 Relator's counsel and Defense counsel. (Declaration of Richard Diaz **Exhibit A**). The  
 12 email between Relator's counsel and the Defendants show that they did not give  
 13 precise email time stamps on several emails that were sent on the same date.  
 14 Furthermore, the Defendants used vague language as to whether the list provided  
 15 would be the entire list that they would introduce at trial. Finally, Relator did file  
 16 another motion in limine to exclude portions of the emails in question. In this separate  
 17 motion in limine, Relator was forced to assume, for several emails, what exactly the  
 18 Defendants were intending to enter into evidence. There was a lack of clarity by the  
 19 Defendants in setting forth which emails they intended to introduce. As Defendants'  
 20 allegations of factual misstatement have been proven false, Relator's motion in limine  
 21 should be granted.

22 **II. THE EMAILS BETWEEN DR. HARASZTI AND RELATOR ARE**  
 23 **NOT RELEVANT TO THE INSTANT ACTION**

24 As detailed in Relator's moving papers, the Emails between Dr. Haraszti and the  
 25 Relator should be excluded pursuant to the Federal Rules of Evidence 401, 402, and  
 26 403. The information contained within the emails from Dr. Haraszti are not relevant to  
 27 the issue of whether Medicare or Medi-Cal were defrauded by the Hospital, or whether  
 28

worthless services were provided to the patients seeking treatment there. In regards to the counterclaims filed against Relator, the emails are arguably minimally relevant – but do not prove that Relator acted outside of activities protected under the False Claims Act. *See* 31 U.S.C. § 3730. As Realtor argued in her motion, any such minimal relevance is substantially outweighed by the emails’ certainty to mislead and confuse the jury and to force the Relator to spend an inordinate amount of time rebutting or contextualizing matters of no real consequence to the issues in this case. (See also, Section III below.)

As the emails sought to be admitted are irrelevant, they must be excluded pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 402.

**III. EVEN IF THIS COURT DETERMINES THE EMAILS BETWEEN DR. HARASZTI AND THE RELATOR ARE RELEVANT, THEIR INTRODUCTION IS PRECLUDED BY FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE 403**

The emails Defendants seek to introduce would confuse issues, mislead the jury, cause delay, waste time and unfairly prejudice Relator. The Defendants claim that the emails should not be precluded by Rule 403 because the emails are not unfairly prejudicial. As cited by Defendants, evidence is unfairly prejudicial if it makes a finding more likely because it provokes an emotional response or otherwise tends to affect adversely the jury’s attitude. *United States v. Ramirez-Jiminez*, 967 F.2d 1321, 1327 (9th Cir.1992). Relator has set out how the emails contain flirtatious and irrelevant comments to Dr. Haraszti that would no doubt provoke an emotional response from the jury. The emails contain sexual references and comments that taken out of context could adversely affect the jury’s attitude toward Relator, even though they have minimal relevance to the claims in this case.

In *Monotype Corp. PLC v. International Typface Corp.*, the United States Court of Appeals affirmed a district court’s decision to exclude emails as evidence for trial. *Monotype Corp. PLC v. International Typface Corp.*, 43 F.3d 443, 450 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994).

1 The district court rejected defendant's arguments and granted Plaintiff's motion in  
2 limine to exclude emails that contained derogatory and offensive remarks because the  
3 prejudicial nature of the evidence outweighed any of its relevancy. *Id.* Similar to  
4 *Monotype*, Relator's emails contain many remarks that would likely be offensive to  
5 many jurors, clouding their judgment and outweighing any possible relevance that  
6 they might have.

7 Lastly, Defendants true intention in introducing Relator's emails is to try and  
8 embarrass and humiliate her and prejudice the jury against her. The Defendants seek to  
9 expose her personal conversations that have no relevance to claims in this action.

#### 10 IV. CONCLUSION

11 Based on the foregoing, Relator respectfully requests Relator's Motion in  
12 Limine No.5 be granted to avoid undue prejudice to Relator.

13  
14 DATED: May 23, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

16 COLLEN FLYNN  
17 MARK A. KLEIMAN  
18 DISABILITY RIGHT LEGAL CENTER

19 /S/ Richard Diaz  
20 Richard Diaz  
21 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28